

# League of Nations Becoming an International Soviet

## Absence of the United States Permits Small Nations to Take Power From Britain and France

By FRANK H. SIMONDS

IN examining the progress of the first session of the League of Nations at Geneva it is essential for all Americans to recognize at the outset that there is a profound difference between the real and the apparent issues there joined. It was the failure to recognize this fact that led first to the deception and then to disillusionment of the United States in the case of the Paris conference. At the very least we should not permit ourselves to be taken in as we were two years ago.

And when I speak of the difference between real and apparent issues it is perhaps worth while to illustrate by example. At Paris late in 1919 a bitter discussion was joined as to the new frontier of Greece in Europe. Should the Hellenic State have all of Thrace or only a portion? Should Bulgaria preserve a facade upon the Aegean? Ostensibly the issue was one of clear principles and the United States emphatically supported the Bulgarian contention, while Britain and France backed Greece. But these European Powers were checked by the interesting fact that Italy supported the United States' view, accepting Mr. Wilson's ideas of self-determination and economic independence.

### Italy's Sudden Change of Front

Gave Thrace to the Greeks

One day, however, without warning, Italy suddenly changed sides and with no further delay Greece obtained the right to occupy Thrace. America was left like Casablanca on the "burning deck." Upon investigation the American representatives discovered that Italy had never been at any time opposed to Greek possession of Thrace or interested in Mr. Wilson's doctrine of self-determination, but that in a dispute between Greece and Italy over divisions of territories in Asia Minor, Italy had bluntly told Greece that the price of Thracian gains was Asiatic sacrifices and, after delay, Greece had concluded to pay. Thus, in fact, American insistence upon the doctrine of self-determination had resulted in a successful "hold up" of Greece in Asia Minor.

Now at Geneva, as at Paris, there was precisely the same effort to use high moral principles to promote quite material practical bargains. In the first place the whole session was dominated by the break between France and Great Britain, a break which is expressed in a total difference of opinion and of selfish national interest in almost every part of the world. For example, France backs the Poles because she sees in Poland a useful ally against Germany. Britain opposes Poland because the British have obtained economic supremacy in the Baltic States, notably in Lithuania, and see in Polish expansion a menace to this supremacy.

The British back the Greeks in the near East because Britain sees in Greece an agent for her own plans in the old Turkish Empire. France backs the Turk because the French see a better chance for their own interests if the Turkish Empire is restored than if Greece, as a British agent, acquires vast territories.

But the great Franco-British quarrels arise out of conflicting policies with respect of Russia and of Germany. France wants to fortify Poland and insure that Russia will repay the old loans of the French, amounting to several billions. Trade with Russia is not important from the French point of view. But Britain wants to trade with Russia at once for the profit there is in it and cares neither for French billions nor Polish security. Both national policies are camouflaged by very lofty principles, but both policies necessarily rest upon very well defined national interests.

As to Germany, Britain has acquired by the Treaty of Versailles the maximum of profit possible from the war and the victory. Germany has lost her colonies, her merchant marine, her navy. She is no longer a rival or a menace, but she remains a possible market, and Britain wants that market and the German customer. But France has not eliminated a military rival, acquired security nor as yet realized any material benefit from

the promised reparations. She opposes German admission into world trade, into the League of Nations, into world relations, pending proof that Germany has laid aside aggressive ambitions and is prepared to pay the indemnities.

It follows, then, that at Geneva and everywhere else France and Great Britain oppose each other. In the Paris conference British diplomacy, infinitely more adroit than French, succeeded in enlisting the United States against France and thus compelling France to bow to British will. But when President Wilson went home and the Senate rejected the Treaty of Versailles France resumed her freedom and has successfully resisted the British effort to impose British will upon her ever since. Geneva was only one more battlefield.

Now the actual struggle between France and Britain at Geneva centered about the Near Eastern situation. Britain was eager to maintain the arrangement created by the Treaty of Sevres and by other and more or less secret bargains, because the profit was with her. France was eager to upset the arrangement because it represented in French eyes a British control of the whole of the eastern Mediterranean. But the French line of attack was through the Armenian question and was, on the surface, an appeal to the humanity of the world. But for Armenia herself neither the French nor the British were prepared to act to send armies, to incur expenses. Both were willing to permit the United States to undertake the task, both were agreed to pass the Armenian question up to the United States, laying stress upon the moral questions involved, but underneath the surface France and Britain were concerned, not because of Armenian extermination but because of the clash of two colonial policies in Asia Minor.

### More Important Angle Is Revolt of the Smaller Nations at Geneva

So much for the Anglo-French phase of the Geneva proceedings. But this phase promptly lost its importance in the presence of a far more serious circumstance, namely, the revolt of the smaller States against the domination and tyranny of the larger. At Paris the fight of the small States against the large was a conspicuous circumstance, but the small States were powerless. Wilson, Lloyd George and Orlando, acting together, again and again crushed the hopes, denied the claims, offended the sensibilities of the little nations, several of which left the conference.

In the constitution of the League of Nations the domination of the great Powers was maintained through the council. Of nine nations therein represented five were to be great Powers, Britain, France, Italy, Japan and the United States. Three Britain, the United States and France, could control, and a single negative blocked effective action.

But the British back the Greeks in the near East because Britain sees in Greece an agent for her own plans in the old Turkish Empire. France backs the Turk because the French see a better chance for their own interests if the Turkish Empire is restored than if Greece, as a British agent, acquires vast territories.

But the great Franco-British quarrels arise out of conflicting policies with respect of Russia and of Germany. France wants to fortify Poland and insure that Russia will repay the old loans of the French, amounting to several billions. Trade with Russia is not important from the French point of view. But Britain wants to trade with Russia at once for the profit there is in it and cares neither for French billions nor Polish security. Both national policies are camouflaged by very lofty principles, but both policies necessarily rest upon very well defined national interests.

As to Germany, Britain has acquired by the Treaty of Versailles the maximum of profit possible from the war and the victory. Germany has lost her colonies, her merchant marine, her navy. She is no longer a rival or a menace, but she remains a possible market, and Britain wants that market and the German customer. But France has not eliminated a military rival, acquired security nor as yet realized any material benefit from

Moreover, in the Paris conception the main purpose of the council was to enforce the settlement made in the various treaties.

But at Geneva more than forty nations were represented in the assembly, as contrasted with the council. Many of these nations had not been belligerents. Only France and Great Britain were at all concerned in the preservation of all the fruits of the victory over Germany. The absence of the United States fatally weakened the prestige of the council, while both Japan and Italy, resentful of their treatment by the British, French and Americans at Paris, were quite prepared to throw their lot in with the assembly.

### Might Be Called Battle

Between Soviet and Senate

The dominating detail at the Geneva conference, then, was this revolt of the assembly against the council, a revolt that one may not inaptly describe as the battle between the Soviet and the Senate.

The assembly desired the admission of the Germans and all the other enemy States to the League of Nations, the destruction of the control of the league by the great Powers, and particularly by France and Great Britain. They were not in the least interested in preserving for Britain and France, the sole beneficiaries with Poland under the Treaty of Versailles, the gains of the war. They were out to take the control of the league away from the great Powers, to scrap the whole Paris settlement so far as it was unattractive to them, and they had both the opportunity and, thanks to an astute German maneuver, promptly acquired the issue.

This issue was the mandatory system. Under the covenant of the League of Nations, German colonies and Turkish territories were distributed among certain nations, not as actual possessions, but as trusteeship estates under the supervision of the League of Nations, and in the league the title was vested. This system was a clever device of British diplomacy to get around Mr. Wilson's "point" about the German colonies.

Mr. Wilson had withdrawn his "freedom of the seas point," but he could not yield on this, while the British, under pressure from their own dominions, were compelled to keep possession of the German colonies.

### Germany Starts Trouble

Over the Mandate Question

Germany, biding her time, suddenly threw a bomb into the Geneva conference by protesting against the mandate system. In point of fact only two great Powers had received important mandates, France and Britain, and Britain fared far better than France. Japan had acquired the mandate for a few Pacific islands, Belgium for certain restricted African lands. But in reality no nations represented at Geneva save only Great Britain and France were vitally concerned in the mandate affair, and Great Britain and France represented precisely the dominating influence in the council which had aroused the assembly.

Thus automatically Germany set the Geneva conference by the ears and called

into debate the whole settlement of Paris. What the Assembly attempted to do was to establish the control of the League of Nations over German colonies taken by Britain and France from Germany and Turkey and thus to make these colonies in reality the possessions of the League of Nations rather than of the mandatory nations. What Germany sought to do was to open a possible avenue to regain her lost colonies by upsetting the Paris division between France and Great Britain.

But it must be manifest that this maneuver has very far reaching possibilities. Not only are the German colonies subject to the League of Nations but so are the Sarre Basin and Danzig. If Great Britain is vitally affected by the colonial phase of the mandatory issue, France is not less directly affected in the case of the Sarre, and because of her Polish policy almost equally concerned as to Danzig. Yet only France and Britain are virtually affected as to the two questions and all the other nations are free to act as they choose without injury to themselves.

### Disarmament Is Not Possible To-day

Either for French or the English

Patently, then, the first session of the League of Nations has led almost automatically to the challenging of the Paris settlement. It has done this by challenging with equal promptitude the whole conception of the League of Nations in the minds of its authors, the British and the Americans. This conception was that the League should be dominated through the council by the Americans and the British, with the assistance of the French. The failure of America to ratify the Treaty of Versailles, the break between the British and the French, these two facts so shattered the whole structure that its very existence was threatened at the first international session.

Now it is easy to perceive the extension of the present battle. To take another question already raised: The small Powers are vitally interested in forcing immediate disarmament. They have suffered terribly, particularly the neutral Powers, because of the burdens of defence. Their position becomes safe in proportion as the great Powers disarm. But how can the French disarm in the presence of the German situation with no indemnity paid and the present coal contributions assured only by the threat of occupation of the Ruhr? How can the British disarm in the presence of trouble in India, in Mesopotamia, in Ireland?

The question goes even more deeply. What the assembly is up to on the question of armament is not hard to perceive. Naval even more than military disarmament is sought or will be sought. And at the appropriate moment German impulsion will raise the old issue of the "freedom of the seas." The neutrals who suffered from the allied blockades during the war are most eager to avoid all repetition. Germany, having no navy, will use every possible method of weakening the British grip upon the oceans. Only Britain, the United States and Japan have real navies now. All the rest of the world is, then, interested in reducing the advantage of these Powers.

## Revolt of the Assembly Against the Council Indicates a World Parliament or Superstate Planned

In reality the lesson of the first Geneva conference is inescapable. Here the League of Nations has almost instantly escaped the control of those who were responsible for its creation and reckoned upon it as the permanent foundation of their own policy and security. Rejected by the United States, deprived of the tremendous influence of American support, this Anglo-French institution, in which French participation was forced, has become a menace for Britain and France and an instrument in German hands. The assembly, composed of a majority of nations having no material interest in preserving the settlement of Versailles, or, indeed, any one of the treaties of Paris, is seeking to upset the control of the victorious nations and to challenge their victory.

In raising the issue of the mandates, under German inspiration, the assembly has attacked the very heart of the British portion of the Paris settlement. It has involved not alone the United Kingdom but the dominions, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa particularly. In pressing the issue of disarmament it has opened up the old German challenge over the "freedom of the seas." In calling up Armenia, under French suggestion, it has brought into question the whole British conception of a Near Eastern settlement. In reality it has attacked Great Britain in three vital points, and its attack is obviously only an opening maneuver, the beginning of a campaign.

At the same time France has been attacked, through British inspiration, in the Polish-Lithuanian dispute, while disarmament carries for France on land the same perils that it carries for Britain on the seas. To disarm France and Great Britain now, this would be for the smaller nations of the assembly a shining triumph, since it would reduce Franco-British strength and influence. Finally, in raising the mandate issue, France is assailed at Danzig and in the Sarre Basin.

### Small Nations Plan a Coup

to Make League a Real Superstate

In reality it seems to me that the outstanding fact at Geneva is that France and Britain have lost control of the League of Nations. Technically they are able, by reason of their veto power in the council, to prevent disturbing action, but to exercise this right of veto in the secret councils of the smaller body is only to accentuate the passion of the larger assembly and lead to hostilities which must either wreck or revolutionize the League of Nations.

To say the thing simply: the Geneva conference discloses the purpose of the smaller Powers to take the control of world affairs out of the hands of the great Powers and make the League of Nations a real World Parliament—a veritable superstate. In doing this the smaller States are not in the least interested in preserving the fruits of the

recent victory over Germany; they are not on the whole as hostile to Germany as to France and Britain, and they are quite capable of making an ally of Germany in the fight which is just beginning.

Moreover, assuming that Germany will presently be admitted to the league, and this is inevitable, the small States will find in Germany a ready and powerful ally in all their assaults upon Anglo-French control of the league. Disarmed herself under the Treaty of Versailles, Germany is bound to advocate the crippling of the French army and of the British fleet to display new enthusiasm to her old advocacy of the "freedom of the seas." In all of this she will be supported by Austria, by Bulgaria, by Hungary, her old partners in war, her present companions in adversity. As for Japan and Italy, neither has any real interest in supporting France or Britain, given the attitude of France and Britain toward them at Versailles and since.

All of which leads up to the single question: What would the United States do in that gallery assuming that we entered? Should we stand with the French and the British against the rest of Europe, perhaps of the world, in preserving the council and thus fortifying the grip of the British and the French upon world power and enabling them to retain the gains of their victory dearly purchased on the battlefield? Or should we join the small States and Germany in upsetting Britain and France, wiping out the results of the recent victory and transforming the League of Nations into a real superstate dominated by majority rule and thus by minor States?

At all events we must perceive the actual as contrasted with the apparent at Geneva. Anglo-French policy seeks to preserve the League of Nations as a machine for executing the terms of the recent victory and preserving the gains therein registered. But Anglo-French solidarity is shaken by the fatal breach between the two partner Powers. With few exceptions all the rest of the world desires to turn the league into a real superstate, in which economic resources are pooled, in which all the advantages of the strong are neutralized, in which control over armies, fleets, colonies, raw materials are vested in the league itself and not in the nations now possessing them.

### Conference to Take Lead Out of Hands of Powers by International Commune

If this means anything it means Sovietizing international affairs. It means Bolshevizing world relations. It is the longest step toward Lenin that has ever been considered by the western world. It is a war upon international capital, by which I mean nations rich in territories and strong in weapons to defend them.

At the Paris conference the whole world situation was in the hands of three men representing the three great States of Britain, France and the United States. At Geneva the most striking single detail is the effort to eliminate this control, now resting in Anglo-French hands, and turn it over to an assembly in which more than forty nations are represented and in which the sheer majority arises inevitably from the weakest, smallest and in some cases the least progressive countries of the planet.

In such an assembly the United States would always be outvoted by the representatives of the States of Central America and of the north of South America, the British Empire might find its fate in the decisions of the new and old States of middle Europe and of the Balkans. South America might demand the elimination of our fleet at the same moment Europe, under German leading, made the same demand of the British Empire. In a word it seems to me that the outstanding circumstance at Geneva is the development of an international communism, political, not economic, primarily, which may prove one of the most amazing facts in contemporary history.

Copyright, 1920, by the McClure Newspaper Syndicate.

## Seventh Regiment's New Colors Now Completed

### War Department's Order Revising Standards Gives Chance to Perpetuate Exploits of the Great War

NEW colors and standards for the many regiments of the regular army and the National Guard have been authorized by the War Department and will soon be regulation throughout the country. Now be it known to the lay mind that such a change is most momentous in military circles, for any soldier worthy of the name will die a thousand deaths rather than surrender the flag of his organization. So sacred is this emblem of the country that he serves that under no circumstances must it ever be permitted to touch the ground.

The changes are not sweeping. Rather are they additions to the old designs. Color sergeants of those organizations that served in France are looking forward to the time when the colors will blaze forth to the world the stories of heroic deeds performed by their members. For the new colors are expected by the War Department to develop the esprit de corps of the units which compose the land defenses of the United States. Military authorities explain for the militarily untechnical that "colors" include the national color or flag and the regimental color of a dismounted organization. Standards

is the name that applies to the banners of mounted units. Both are guarded and tended with honors, and woe be unto that body of men which allows the enemy to take its colors. New colors must be earned on the battlefield, and the stain of the loss of a flag can only be washed off with blood.

It is said that a certain regiment lost its colors to the Mexicans in 1846 and regained them only in the Spanish-American war. Perhaps it was later, in the world war, that they were regained, and perhaps the story is not true at all. An army officer who told this tale said he could not imagine an American regiment losing its colors, and he was inclined to believe that the story was based on what might have happened, and not what did.

A regimental standard may on occasion be dipped in salute, but the national standard never. Army regulations provide that as troops on parade pass a reviewing stand the regimental standard will be dropped a few inches in acknowledgment of the authority of the reviewer. But the national standard represents the United States itself and recognizes no authority above the people from whom authority is derived, and therefore it salutes no one.

The new regimental colors will give the histories of the various organizations at a glance. Great latitude is allowed by the War Department in the choice of symbols, but none can be adopted without approval by the Adjutant-General in Washington. Certain symbols have been suggested in circulars published by the War Department as being especially suitable for indicating participation in the various wars in which this country has engaged. A conventional castle, for instance, is suggested as a symbol to indicate the Spanish-American war, while a cactus leaf is offered as being suggestive of the Mexican war. The world war will be represented by a palm wreath.

### Seventh Regiment Old, But Gets Credit For Participation in World War Only

The designer of the new colors of the Seventh Regiment, New York National Guard, was surprised to find that this old regiment, which dates back to 1806 and whose membership includes many young men of some of New York's oldest families, was entitled to credit for participation in the world war only.

Originally the Seventh Regiment was a four company battalion of artillery, mustered into State service in 1806. In 1807 it became the Second Battalion of the Third State Infantry. The regiment was renamed the Eleventh later on, and it was under this name that it served in the war of 1812. After the little unpleasantness with England was over the organization changed its name again. This time the Second Battalion was removed from the regiment, enlarged and called the Second Regiment. It was the Second Regiment which adopted the name National Guards, from the French organization of that name. A visit of the Marquis de Lafayette to this country was the inspiration for giving it this name.

Not long after the adoption of the name

other militia regiments adopted it, and the jealous Second Regiment objected so strenuously to the use of the name by any other organization that the Federal Government intervened and gave the name as the exclusive right to the first claimants. It was not until 1862 that it was extended to include all the State soldiery.

### Banner Cannot Depict All Incidents in Regiment's History

In 1826 the Second Battalion of the Second Regiment had grown into six companies, and the Governor authorized its transformation into a regiment. It then became known as the Twenty-seventh Infantry.

Its next and last change of name was in 1847, when it became the Seventh Regiment of Infantry, National Guard, New York. These details of its history cannot well be shown on the banner, since, in the words of the War Department's orders, the "devices are intended to commemorate the services and historical deeds of the organization," and, "if possible, some symbol should be used to commemorate the birth or initial service of the organization; if organized from some one State or section of the country an identification of the unit therewith should have good results."

What military organization is more closely identified with New York than the Seventh? There are others of which New York is equally proud, but it has been said, and not without cause, that the history of the Seventh is the history of New York. The State Adjutant-General has taken care of this problem, however, in designating as one symbol of all New York regiments the State coat of arms. No cause for jealousy between units exists there.

In the four corners of the flag are to be shown the symbols of the regiment's engagements. Although the organization is old and holds an enviable record, it was not until the world war, when Secretary Baker gave it the opportunity to serve as the 107th United States Infantry, that it first saw action that could be shown on the colors. Three times during the civil war it was sent to guard Washington when the Confederacy threatened to take the capital, and three times it was recalled. Six hundred men were taken from its ranks and made officers in other regiments. Finally it was returned to New York to quell the draft riots that had started here, and here it remained during the rest of the war. It had similar fortune in the other wars in which this country has participated.

### Symbols Representing Part Played in the Recent Conflict

So in the upper left hand corner has been placed a laurel wreath representing the world war, surrounding the Twenty-seventh Division insignia—the constellation Orion and a combination of the letters "N. Y." Underneath the division insignia will be the names of the battles of the Meuse-Argonne, in which the regiment participated. Distinctive of the regiment itself will be the device over the State escutcheon. This

is to be and long has been used on the stationery of the regiment and elsewhere. A shield, with the national colors blazoned in one quarter, a sunset and cannon to show the artillery origin of the regiment are shown. In the center, another shield, a smaller one, is represented. This has the initials "N. G." on it to indicate the regiment's original claim to the title National Guard.

Back of the shield are the national and original regimental colors. Resting on their pikes is a ribbon with the words, "7 Regiment, National Guard." Over the shield is an eagle, flying.

The banner itself is blue, and blue predominates in the color scheme of the three designs. State, divisional and regimental. But there are touches of brilliant red and gold and green to relieve the eye, and underneath the escutcheon are two ribbons. The upper, a gray one, has "Excelsior" in blue letters on it, and the lower one has the inscription "Seventh N. Y. G. Infantry."

## How Faces Fit Occupations

It seems to be pretty well agreed among those in a position to speak authoritatively that associated with the various occupations in life there is undoubtedly a type of face which more or less betrays the calling of its owner.

Medical men, especially in hospital practice, find acquaintance with these types valuable. They may not be able, with the shrewdness of Sherlock Holmes or of other acute persons, to read a man's past, present and future by a glance at him in the street, but they are able to gauge with considerable accuracy how far the history of the case, as given by the patient, is a truthful one, and how far it fits with his probable occupation in life.

Calling must certainly have some influence over the physiognomy of the cabman, the butcher or the groom; each frequently possesses a type of face which wears so characteristic an expression as to make it not difficult to identify the vocation accompanying it.

We speak also of the legal face, the musical face, the dramatic face and the military face. This is merely a broad classification, and the best authorities disbelieve in the claims of the keen observer that he can differentiate to a finer degree. There are tales of hospital physicians who claim to be able to say from a glance at the face that this or that man is a butcher, a grocer, a bank clerk, a lawyer's clerk, a commercial traveller, a stock broker, and so on. It is thought that the fame of these medical men as rough and ready detectives has been largely manufactured for them by enthusiastic friends. But that many medical men do possess great insight into the occupations of those who come before them is true. The question is often debated whether physiognomy is a growth of vocation or whether it shows that the vocation chosen is in accordance with the particular capacity and ability of the person to whom it belongs. In other words, if the lawyer does not show the "legal face," the aspiring minister the "ecclesiastical face," the medical student the "physician's face," the soldier the "military face," and so on, the question arises, Is that a sign that they have mistaken their calling? Is the man who "doesn't look a bit like a doctor" likely to fall because his physiognomic qualification is wanting? Or will he, whatever his original features, gradually come to acquire the type of the profession to which he belongs?

The answer to the question is, of course, that both theories are right. A certain kind of face, the so-called scientific face, is so often seen among medical students as to prove that the owner of that cast of countenance is likely to adopt medicine as a career. Conversely, whatever the original cast of features a medical man may have possessed, the anxious, delicate and absorbing work of medical practice will put a stamp upon them.

On Losing a Garter  
PEOPLE have been known to suffer from a loss of their good name. Old Polonius featured this kind of loss to his son Laertes, about to return to Paris. It would be called a tragedy, I think, even for persons whose acquaintance is very limited.

Again, to lose even a small amount of money has been found disconcerting. Say that one has eaten a pretty good dinner in a restaurant and after turning oneself inside out one has come to the conclusion that one has been robbed or has lost every cent, isn't it provoking to have the proprietor look one over with a quizzical smile, even a smile of disbelief, when making the necessary explanation in order to obtain enforced credit? A handkerchief lost from one's large pocket is on his smirk behavior in society and just after saying a bright thing that has called everybody's gaze to his face he feels a sudden, an irresistible, urge to sneeze. In fact, it's tragic then to lack the linen curtain.

These losses are trivial compared to a loss that needs no emphasis to describe its hopelessness. I refer to an article, simple in itself and supposed to be always invisible. How do you feel when you suddenly realize that you have lost a garter? Perhaps if you could know that it was really lost it would be possible to bear it without flinching. But there intrudes the horrid thought that it may not be really lost after all! It may confront you or turn up in the rear without a word of warning. What are you going to do with the thing—claim it?

## Recruiting for Camp Travis

THE five R's, the last two being religion and recreation, are provided for new soldiers at Camp Travis, near San Antonio, Tex., which is the vocational school of the famous Second Division, the Indian Host, who made history in France at Belleau Wood and Vaux. It is stationed there and all recruits who now

## Birdland Eviction

THE squirrel is pretty, thrifty and industrious—but he has his faults. He likes to use the nests which woodpeckers hollow out of the tree trunks, and he is not always willing to wait until the bird deserts her nest. Here is a story of the way in which an impudent squirrel actually turned a family of woodpeckers out of their home.

The squirrel, descending a tree trunk, suddenly found a hole, into which two of his legs slipped. Probably he felt something sharp pecking at them, for he drew them out quickly and rapidly climbed to a branch immediately above. A moment later a woodpecker flew out of the hole.

The squirrel watched her out of sight and then returned to the nest and helped himself to an egg or two, which he carried to his perch and ate. When these were disposed of, he descended once more to the woodpecker's nest and waited for the return of the bird.

The moment she appeared at the entrance to her nest the squirrel flew at her like an angry cat. The startled woodpecker fled in fear, and the squirrel came forth triumphantly and went away for a short time. While he was away the woodpecker came again and looked into her nest. Something, however, probably a broken egg, displeased her, and she flew away again. Shortly afterward her mate looked into the nest, but he, too, was dissatisfied and flew away.

The squirrel promptly took possession of the deserted nest, and when autumn came he turned it into a storehouse for nuts.